Order

Michigan Supreme Court Lansing, Michigan

July 13, 2005

ADM File No. 2003-04

Clifford W. Taylor Chief Justice

Michael F. Cavanagh Elizabeth A. Weaver Marilyn Kelly Maura D. Corrigan Robert P. Young, Jr. Stephen J. Markman Justices

Amendment of Administrative Order No. 2000-3

On order of the Court, Administrative Order No. 2000-3 is amended as follows, effective January 1, 2006.

[The present language is amended as indicated below by strikeover for text that is deleted.]

Administrative Order 2000-3.
Video Proceedings
(Circuit and District Courts)

On order of the Court, Administrative Orders 1990-1, 1991-2, 1992-1, and 1993-1 are rescinded.

The State Court Administrator is authorized, until further order of this Court, to approve the use of two-way interactive video technology in the criminal divisions of the circuit and district courts to conduct the following proceedings between a courtroom and a prison, jail, or other place of detention: initial arraignments on the warrant, arraignments on the information, pretrials, pleas, sentencing for misdemeanor offenses, show cause hearings, waivers and adjournments of extradition, referrals for forensic determination of competency, and waivers and adjournments of preliminary examinations.

Each court seeking to use interactive video technology must submit a local administrative order for approval by the State Court Administrator pursuant to MCR 8.112(B), describing how the program will be implemented and the administrative procedures for each type of hearing for which interactive video technology will be used. Upon a court's filing of a local administrative order, the State Court Administrative Office shall either approve the order or return the order to the chief circuit or district judge for a mendment in a coordance with requirements and guidelines provided by the Sate Court Administrative Office.

Courts that previously were authorized to use interactive video technology pursuant to Administrative Orders 1990-1, 1991-2, 1992-1, or 1993-1 may continue to do so until further order of this Court or the State Court Administrator.

The State Court Administrative Office shall assist courts in implementing the technology, and shall report periodically to this Court regarding its assessment of the program. Those courts using the technology shall provide statistics and otherwise cooperate with the State Court Administrative Office in monitoring the use of two way video proceedings.

Staff Comment: Effective January 1, 2006, video and audio proceedings are governed by MCR 6.006.



I, CORBIN R. DAVIS, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

July 13, 200 5

olige J. Mys

Clerk